

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/601,723	CANFIELD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	George Manuel	3762	

All Participants:

(1) George Manuel.

(2) Malcolm J. Romano.

Status of Application: ____

(3) ____

(4) ____

Date of Interview: 13 April 2007

Time: ____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

25

Prior art documents discussed:

Schulman (US 4,071,032) and Schulman et al (US 5,358,514) and Klosterman et al (US 7,177,698)


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was agreed the prior art does not show the feature of a cylindrical tube formed as a unitary structure solely of ferrite in a microstimulator; and the limitation of the sleeve length being substantially coextensive with the length of the ferrite tube is not necessary to distinguish Applicant's claimed invention over the prior art..